



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/784,235

02/24/2004

Jerome Bayle

612.43484X00

1580

20457 7590 10/20/2008  
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP  
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET  
SUITE 1800  
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER

MERKLING, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1795

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/20/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|                          |  |                                     |  |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>Interview Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/784,235   | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>BAYLE ET AL. |  |
|                          | <b>Examiner</b><br>MATTHEW J. MERKLING | <b>Art Unit</b><br>1795             |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MATTHEW J. MERKLING. (3) \_\_\_\_.

(2) Alan Schiavelli. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 16 October 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic    b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant    2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes    e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ishii.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached.    g) ☒ was not reached.    h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative suggested a possible amendment to claim 1 to distinguish the present invention over Ishii. Mr. Schiavelli suggested adding that zones Z1 and Z2 are separated by a conduit such that the zones are not contained within the same vessel. The examiner indicated that as long as there is support in the originally filed disclosure, such an amendment appears to overcome the prior art of record, however a further search is required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| /M. J. M./<br>Examiner, Art Unit 1795 | /Alexa D. Neckel/<br>Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795 |
|---------------------------------------|---|